G. R. S. 59] GPB—15,000—22-7-14

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1900-01
~~191~~ .
(Murrai)

File No. 137

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

*Month*_____

SUBJECT.

Re the payment of gratuity to C. Rajachuo, late Head Parkathegar of H.H. the Maharaja's Chattram at Mysore

PREVIOUS REFERENCES. LATER REFERENCES.

Transferred to Muzrai Branch 18-6-01

17/6/07.

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date .....
REG. No 1470
MUZRAI BRANCH

No. 2726

Name of Petitioner C. Raja Rao,

Village c/o Mr. C. Krishna Murthy Advocate, Gundopanth Street, Siddhicutta,

Taluk Bangalore

District

Date of Arzi 12-6-07

Date of Receipt 13-6-07

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil

Read
18/6/07

Submitted for orders

18/6/07 Sd/ [illegible]

Sd/ [illegible]

Practices are being given to in the Magazine to prevent throwing out in the redirections.

Petr rendered a service of 5 years odd and resigned of his own accord —

Sd/ 4/7/07

He was last in Prasanna Krishna Swamy Temple — Police Constable

What he has to say in regard to his application

Sd/ [illegible]

17 VIII 07

ABSTRACT

The petitioner states that he was the Head Parpattegar of the Mysore Govt Chattram; that as such he was drawing a pay of Rs 30 per mensem; that he retired from service in December 1897; that he has put in a service of 6 years and 26 days; and that his application for gratuity has not yet been disposed of.

He prays for the grant

of gratuity due to him.

Kaaj
15/6/01

From

THE SECRETARY TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

To

The Palace Controller
Mysore.

Dated 21st August 1901.

Despatched

Received

General No. 264 & 265

Muzrai F. No 17-97

Enclosure No. 1

In forwarding herewith an application Registered No. 1470 dated 12th June 1901 from C. Raja Row, late Head-Parapatheyar of H H the Maharajah's Chattram at Mysore, praying for the payment of gratuity for the period of service rendered by him in the Muzrai duties under the management of the Palace Controller, has the honor to request that the

Palace Controller will be good enough to favour Government with his opinion as regards the application.

B. O.

(Dewan's order) Sd/ 21/8/01
By Secretary

Sd/

No 265
Endorsement to the Petitioner informing him of the above

Bangalore City
12 6 01

Mysore Post Registered
13.6.01
2726



The Dewan of Mysore

The humble petition of C. Raja Rao late Head-Parpathagar of Mysore Government Chuttram most respectfully Sheweth:—

He begs to state herein that having from the 9th September 1892 to 5th Dece 1897 discharged with fear and faith the onerous duties, ordinary and extraordinary pertaining to his office, he retired from the post on the 6th Dece 1897, that his total service comes to about 5 years and 26 days; that at the retiring time he was drawing a pay of Rs 30 per mensem and that therefore, being entitled to gratuity he put in an application for the same on the 30th June 1898 to the Secretary to the Government in the Muzrai department in due course with Service list

2 That the gratuity due to him has not as yet been paid to him; that by reasons of time, place and age he has been put to great inconvenience and trouble, that he is now 75 years of age; that under these circumstances he most humbly prays that the Government would be

be pleased to grant him the gratuity and protect him

3. That the late Parpathagar of the same Mysore Chuttram, Seshia Aiyengar, has been drawing from a long time past a pension of Rs 6 per mensem sanctioned and paid by the Muzrai Dept, that the Muzrai Huzur office clerk Pandyam Raghavendrappah, has been drawing a pension of Rs 7.1/2 per mensem, sanctioned and paid by the Muzrai Dept; that a gratuity of about Rs 300 was sanctioned and paid to Huzur Muzrai office clerk Gangadharam Pillay. that a gratuity of about Rs 540 was sanctioned and paid to Huzur Muzrai office Head clerk Annaji Rao; that further so recently as a few months ago the Muzrai Dept sanctioned a pension of Rs 20 per mensem to the late Rishkar of His Highness the Maharajahs Chuttram, Srinivasa Raghava Aiyengar, at Tirupati in the North Arcot District; that having regard to these precedents in the case and to his age and the services he has rendered to His Highness' Government he most humbly prays that the Honble the Dewan will be pleased to sanction him the gratuity due to him and protect him.

4. For which act of Kindness i. shall ever pray.

(Sd) C Raja Rao
c/o C Krishnamurti,
Advocate, Gundopunti street
Sidaventta, Bangalore Cty.

28

No. 15

Enclosures.

9/9/01

PALACE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE,
Mysore.

Dated 5/6th September 1901

Vide no. 264-1-02

9.9.01

165 From V. N. Narasimmiyengar, Esq.,
THE PALACE CONTROLLER,
Mysore.

Submitted for orders with previous papers

9/9/01

To
L. Anantasami Rao, Esq.,
Deputy Secretary to the
Government of Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

In reply to your docket no. 264 Judl. 17-97 dated 21st August 1901, I have the honour to state that I am not aware of anything done by C. Raja Row, Ex-Parpatyagar, which would entitle him to a gratuity in the Nuzzroi Dept, in which gratuities are an exception. On the contrary, there are on record certain facts against him, which go distinctly to negative his claim.

Your enclosures are returned.

I have the honor to be,
Sir
your most obedient servant,
V. N. Narasimmiyengar
Palace Controller.

Noted to the Dewan
9/9/01

3207
R231.1.02

6155

The Controller is apprised
Sanctioned
No gratuity can be granted
9/9/01
17.III.02

GR
Compd

No 1480 D/24/3/02
Murai 17-92
1481

Endorsement.

Petition No 1470, dated 12th June 1901, from C. Raja Rao late Head Parpattegar of H.H. the Maharaja's Chattram at Mysore, praying for the payment of gratuity for the period of service rendered by him in the Murrai Institution under the management of the Palace Controller, Mysore

—"—

In reply, the petitioner is informed that ~~the Palace Controller who was not the~~ gratuities are given in the Murrai Deptt only in exceptional cases, and the Palace Controller ~~on the subject~~ reports that ~~he is not aware of anything~~ he reports that there is no circumstances in the Petitioners short service ~~done by the petitioner which~~ entitling him to a gratuity. ~~would entitle him to a gratuity in the Murrai Deptt~~ P.T.O. ~~in which gratuities are not~~ ~~excepting. The Govt therefore~~ ~~do not therefore see their way~~

to grant the payment of any gratuity prayed for by the petitioner.

No gratuity can be sanctioned before the grant is made to the Petr.

By order,

(Demm's order)

Dy Secretary,

Mun: Dept.

22/3/02

Copy is forwarded to the Palace Controller, Mysore, with reference to his letter No. 15, dated 5th September 1901.

By order,

Dy Secretary

Mun. Dept.

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date
Reg. No. 4077
MUNICH

No. 2918

Name of Petitioner C. Raja Rao
late Head Parapatyagar of
H.H. the Maharaja's Chatrum
Village Mysore
Residing in
Taluk Booboo Lodge
District Egmore Madras

Date of Arzi 14 } 4.02
Date of Receipt 17 }

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure nil.

ABSTRACT

States that he is in receipt of Order No. 1480 & 24.3.02 of the Deputy Secy Inuzarai Dept on his petn No. 1470 & 12.6.01, praying for the payment of gratuity for the period of service he rendered in the Inuzarai Dept under the Palace Controller;

that he is refused his legitimate gratuity on the ground that "Gratuities are given in the Inuzarai Dept only in exceptional cases and the Palace Cont^r. Reports that there is no circumstances in the petnr's short service entitling

Forwarded to Mysore Department
& P.S.O.R.
12/5/02

Submitted for orders with papers
Jr
17/5/02

The papers passed the subject are formal and Cannot be proceeded further
7-7-02

MGCPB—4,000—31-1-03

him to gratuity

As for not being classed under the exceptional head, the petn. urges that his is the typically exceptional case deserving of the gratuity inasmuch as he has served with conspicuous ability and zeal for 5 continuous years, and more with the full approbation and appreciation of his superiors — Messrs E. R. Subba Rayan B.A., B.L. D. Sitarama Rao, and R.B. A. Srinivasachariu — and without any remarks and such other things indicative of the least disapprobation of his methods of work and management.

As to his short service, he states that his total service amounts to very closely upon 5 years & 3 months, and that according to Rules & Regulations of the Govt., he is entitled to gratuity.

The petn. further submits that he has not been on good terms with the present controller under whom he served only for about 2½ months, and prays that the Govt. may not be

induced, therefore, by the remarks of the present Controller to refuse the gratuity claimed by the petitr.

And he further prays that his case may be reconsidered and that early orders be passed granting him the gratuity to which he is entitled.

Hugh.

8. 5. 02.

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date
REG. No. 4077
MUZRAI BRANCH

MYSORE DEPARTMENT
REG'D. No. 2918 R
DATE 17-4-1902

By [illegible]

To
The Dewan of Mysore

2918

The humble petition of Chapu Rao late Head Parpathegar of H. H. The Maharajahs Chattram, Mysore, most respectfully shewet

1. That he is in receipt of Order No. 1480 dt 24 March 1902 of the Deputy Secretary Muzrai department on his petition No. 1479 dt 12th June 1901, praying for payment of pahrig for the period of service rendered by him in the Muzrai department under the Palace Controller, Mysore.

2. That he regrets to find therefrom that he is refused his legitimate pahrig on the ground that "gratuities are given in the Muzrai department only in exceptional cases and the Palace Controller reports that there is no circumstance in the petitioners short service entitling him to a pahrig.

3. That he most respectfully submits that the view of his case is based upon the [illegible] as the order in question is based entirely upon them he begs leave to expose them and further most humbly requests that the Honble the Dewan will be graciously pleased to review his just case in the light of the circumstances stated here-

The petitioner most humbly submits that such actual services as accrued to him in quick succession the above enumerated pensions do not merit to be classed under the exceptional head claimed for by the Controller as indicated in the order communicated to him to entitle a minister but poor and aged servant in the nursing department to claim his just and legal patriotic. The petitioner further submits that almost the whole period of his service of more than 5 years was spent during the Controllerships of messrs E. R. Sulivan B.A. B.C.L. and D. A. T. Panet Esq already decided and that they may be called upon communicated with as to the petitioners real rights and claims for the patriotic pay'd by him and thus far denied him. Situated as he is the petitioner is not in a position to know what might be the remarks of the heads of Departments under whom he may have served only for about 2½ months — that has induced the Government to grant the patriotic claimed by him. Nor has the remarks been communicated to him. If a copy of the same is communicated to him, the petitioner would be enabled to show to him the duties on what grounds they are based, and whether they could or could not

be relied upon in coming to final judgment on the petitioner's Claims. Despite these and sundry other difficulties under which he labours the petitioner begs to submit that within the short period of 2½ months the present Controller on whose sole opinion the order of rejection is based had no opportunity whatsoever to form a correct opinion as to the petitioner's Claims for his patriotic and that the only persons who might with justice and reason be said to have had it are Messrs E. R. Sabnayan B.A. B.C.C. & S. Venkata Rao and Rai Bahadur Srinivasa Achariar, the late Mysore Secretary to Government under all whom he served with conspicuous ability and zeal for five continuous years and more with their full approbation and appreciation and without he is constrained to add any remarks and such other things which at the least disapprobation of his methods of work and management. He further most begs to add though personally he is not against it that the petitioner — [illegible] before he became an employee in the Palace Controller — had [illegible] been on the best of terms with the present Controller — long long before the

post — who has, he begs respectfully, to add imported apparently the personal element into the consideration of a question purely public in character. The petitioner highly regrets that he has to plainly speak the truth but his justification for it is the utter want of either justice or grounds for the present Palace Controller's reporting "that there is no circumstance in the petitioner's case short of service entitling him to a gratuity." That there are circumstances which render his case a peculiar and exceptional one for the grant of the gratuity the petitioner has shown above and can be easily made out by the Government from it as also, if that were indeed deemed necessary by calling for reports on the merits of his case from Messrs E. R. Subrayar, Sir Ram Rao and Rai Bahadur A. Srinivasa Ayyangar and so by perusal of papers now in the Maharaja Secretary's office in connection with the several promotions that the petitioner got in which their opinions of his abilities and qualifications are recorded. Finally the petitioner most respectfully submits that if the present

Controller had forsooth endeavoured to do justice to the petitioner in the matter he would certainly in the interests of justice have come to a conclusion based upon facts and supported by reasoning and certainly far different from the present one upon which solely the Benefit Government's order seems to be based. Taking for granted that the standard of circumstances that would make a case an exceptional one be in the opinion of the present Controller not altogether an ideal one the petitioner contends that his is a typically exceptional case deserving of the patriotic claims according to rules and regulations laid down on the subject by Government.

5. That the second reason given for the non-payment of his patriotic claim is that the petitioner's short service does not entitle him to the claim put forward by him. Apparently it would appear that the present Controller wishes to make capital out of the so called short service of the poor petitioner. The petitioner most respectfully begs leave to point out that his total service amounts to very close upon 5 years and 3 months. According to rules and regulations of the Government

servant is, if he is disqualified otherwise, entitled to 1/6th pension after a service of 10 years and for periods of less duration he is entitled to gratuity. It is submitted that there is nothing in these rules and regulations that fix a period of service as necessary for a claim of gratuity. It is held merely that the periods of service of less duration than ten years are to be met by payments of gratuity. Even if such a period arbitrary as it should be and unsatisfactory as it is, is insisted on the petitioner's service of five years and more certainly he contends, entitles him to the benefit of the gratuity rule. He has clearly completed more than half the service that would entitle him to 1/6th pension under pension rules.

5. In these circumstances and considering the satisfactory manner in which he has, in the unanimous opinion of the officers under whom he served he served almost the whole period of five years and more of his service and who alone had any opportunity to form a correct judgment of his merits, discharged the onerous responsibilities of his office the long delay in the payment of his last Annuity and his age of seventy six years, the petitioner most humbly

the Hon. the Dewan will be graciously pleased to reconsider the decision which he has been so hardly unfortunate circumstances, to form on his case and early order the patent to which he is entitled and which he has claimed in his petition No. 1470 of 12th June 1901.

7. For which act of kindness he shall ever pray.

Boobas Lodge,
Egmore Madras.
14th April 1902.

Endorsement.

R.O. 88 Dy 9th July 02.
Mur/F. 17.97

In reply to his petn
R.O. 1077 Dy 14th April 1902
praying for re-consideration
of the orders passed in this
Office R.O. 1480 Dy 24th March
Mur2717-97
1902 ~~do~~ directing that
no gratuity can be granted
to him, C. Raja Rao, is
informed that the orders
passed are final and
that the subject cannot
be re-opened.

By order
Sd
8.7.1902
for Dy Secretary
Mur Rev Dept

To. C. Raja Rao
residing in Boobo Lodge
Egmore - Madras